

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated June 22, 2004 has been carefully considered, and it is noted with appreciation that claims 7-22 are allowed.

By the foregoing amendment, claim 23 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1 to more clearly define the structure of applicant's grommet and, for the reasons set forth hereinafter, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 as previously amended and claims 23-28 as herein amended patentably distinguish from the prior art and are allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 and 23-28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semrau 4,901,395. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that it is not supported either by the disclosure of Semrau or by well accepted legal authority.

It is the examiner's contention that (1) the end 28' of the grommet in Figure 3 of Semrau has an inner surface radially spaced from the conductor, (2) that applicant does not state a particular problem solved by the claimed arcuate and converging outer and inner surfaces of the other end of applicant's grommet, and (3) that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the grommet of Semrau with applicant's claimed arcuate and converging contour.

To begin with, the inner surface of Semrau's grommet at end 28' thereof is not radially spaced from the conductor. To the contrary, the inner surface of Semrau's grommet engages the conductor along the entire length of the grommet. Secondly, it is clear from applicant's disclosure at page 3, lines 1-6 and 17-19 and at page 5, lines 8-23 that the arcuate and converging structure of applicant's claimed wall portion "...provides rigidity and stability for the grommet relative to shield 12 when the grommet is mounted thereon...." Applicant's structure is not a mere change of form but, rather, a specific profile provided for a specific purpose. Thirdly, it is well known that the mere fact

that a worker in the art could modify a reference to meet applicant's claims is not by itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. See, for example, *Ex Parte Chicago Rawhide Manufacturing Co.*, (PTOBOA 1984) 223 USPQ 351, 353. As further stated by the Board of Appeals in the latter case, "The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of the applicant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." It is respectfully submitted that applicant's disclosure is the only source for suggesting the modification of Semrau proposed by the examiner.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 and 23-28 patentably distinguish from Semrau and are allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration, withdrawal of the final rejection and allowance of claims 1-6 and 23-28 is respectfully solicited.

Formal drawings to replace the informal drawings filed with the application and which include the correction proposed in applicant's amendment filed May 20, 2004 are submitted herewith.

An earnest effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

By:



JAMES W. McKEE (Reg. No. 26,482)  
1100 Superior Avenue - 7th Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582 (phone)  
(216) 241-1666 (facsimile)